



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/527,773	03/14/2005	Heiko Pelzer	DE 020210	1791
24737	7590	11/16/2007		
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			EXAMINER ABDIN, SHAHEDA A	
			ART UNIT 2629	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/16/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/527,773

Applicant(s)

PELZER ET AL.

Examiner

Shaheda A. Abdin

Art Unit

2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 March 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 March 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### **Priority**

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

### ***Claim Objections***

2. Claims 1-10 are objected to because of the following informalities: The use of parentheses in claims 1-10 are improper because the parentheses uses only for the reference characters (see MPEP 608.01(M)). Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Specification***

3. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

### **Abstract**

4. This application does not contain an abstract of the disclosure as required by 37 CFR 1.72(b). An abstract on a separate sheet is required.

The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

### **Arrangement of the Specification**

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

Art Unit: 2629

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT.
- (e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC.
- (f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
  - (1) Field of the Invention.
  - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
- (j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (l) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1,3,4-5,8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sandbank (GB 2118803 A, see the IDS) in view of (Yokoyama US 6547400 B1).

(1) Regarding claim 1:

Sandbank teaches (in Fig. 2) an active display (e.g. 1) having a display face with active pixels (RGB), in which a radiation-sensitive control unit (4) is assigned to each pixel and is adapted to control the light radiation of the pixel in accordance with a signal beam (2) received by the control unit (4) (column 1, page 1, lines 70-80) .

Note that Sandbank teaches a control unit pixel but does not teach that control unit is locally assigned to each pixel.

However, Yokoyama teaches a control unit (e.g. (218, 220, 222)) is locally assigned to each pixel (103R, 103G, 103B) (note that control unit 218, 220, 222 is assigned to pixel 103R, 103G, 103B respectively) (column 13, lines 50-67, column 14, lines 1-9 and Fig. 14).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate a control unit as taught by Yokoyama in to the display system of Sandbank so that control unit could be assign to assigned to each pixel and which could be adapted to control the light radiation of the pixel in accordance with a signal beam received by the control unit. In this configuration the system would have uniformity in color distribution which could give a high quality image in the display device (Yokoyama, column 5, lines 59-63).

(2) Regarding claim 3:

Yokoyama teaches control unit (locally assigned control unit) and Sandbank teaches radiation sensor (4)(column 1, page 1, lines 70-80). Therefore, at least one control unit (4) could be comprising radiation sensors being having different spectral

sensitivities and is adapted to receive mutually independent parts of the signal beam (I) by means of the radiation sensors. Thus the references meet the claim limitations.

(3) Regarding claim 4:

Yokoyama teaches that at least one pixel (e.g. 103) comprises one or more light-emitting diodes (e.g. R or G or B) (column 13, lines 10-20).

(4) Regarding claim 5:

Sandbank teaches the pixels (e.g. 8, pixel in display 1) and/or the control units (4) are connected to electric power supply lines (+10, -10) extending through the display face (see Fig. 3, column 1, I page 2, lines 75-93).

(5) Regarding claim 8:

Note that claim 8 is a combination of claim 1 and 7. See the discussion in claims 1 and 7 above.

(6) Regarding claim 10:

Sandbank teaches that the signal beam (2) consists of infrared light and/or ultraviolet light (column 1, page1, lines 99-108).

7. Claims 2, 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sandbank in view of Yokoyama as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Thomas et al. (US Patent No: 4141000).

(1) Regarding claim 2:

Note that Sandbank teaches signal beam and Yokoyama teaches locally assigned control unit but both Sandbank and Yokoyama do not teaches a decoder.

However, Thomas in the same field of endeavor teaches a decoder (e.g. binary decoder 200) (Fig. 2, column 3, lines 15-25).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate a decoder as taught by Tomas in to the display system of Sandbank as modified by Yokoyama so that at least one control unit could be comprised a decoder for extracting digitally encoded information comprised in the received signal beam. In this configuration the system would have an economic and suitable display device with accurate data transition (Tomas, column 1, lines 59-63).

(2) Regarding claim 7:

Note that Sandbank teaches a projection device (3) for displaying an image on a projection face, particularly on a display (e.g. 1), comprising an optical system for deflecting beams (2) to points on the projection face (e.g. 1) (column 1, page 1, lines 20-29) , and Thomas teaches a digital encoder (200) . Therefore, the projection device could be adapted to digitally encode (by digital encoder 200) (Fig. 2, column 3, lines 15-25) the image information being displayed at one point of the projection face into a beam (2) deflected to said point. Thus the references meet the claim limitations.

(3) Regarding claim 9:

Note that Sandbank teaches signal beam and Tomas discloses an pixel in a digitally encoded form (column 3, lines 15-33, note the illustration in Fig. 2 the binary decoder 200 have the out put 210 as a digital form). Thus the references meet the claim limitations.

8. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sandbank in view of Yokoyama as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Asamura et al. (US Patent No: 6853354).

(6) Regarding claim 6:

Note that Sandbank does not teach an active display characterized in that it has plug-in connections for combining it with similar displays.

However, Asamura in the same field of endeavor teaches an active display (8 in Fig. 2) characterized in that it has plug-in connections for combining it with similar displays (A, B, C) (note the illustration in Fig. 2 that an active display combining with multiple display unit A,B, and C) (column 2, lines 1-30).

Therefore, it would have obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate a method of plug in connections for combining with similar display as taught by Asamura in to the display system of Sansbank so that an active display can be characterized in such that it could have plug-in connections for combining it with similar displays. In this configuration the system would have accurate image information with correct image in the display device ( Asamura, column 4, lines



Art Unit: 2629

49-51).

### **Conclusion**

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Barnson (US Patent No: 6819304) discloses an adjustable display device with display adjustment function and method .

### **Inquiry**

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to the examiner at (571) 270-1673 Monday- Friday 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chanh Nguyen, can be reached at (571) 272-7772.

Information regarding the status on an application may be obtained from the Patent Application information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the

Art Unit: 2629

automated information system, call 800-786-9799 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of patents and trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231


**Or fax to:**

**(703)872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)**

Shaheda Abdin

11/12/2007

.....

  
CHANH D. NGUYEN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER